

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**MCRC No. 2763 of 2019**

- Vishnu Prasad S/o Shri Panchu Ram Aged About 60 Years Caste - Teli, R/o Village Sankari, Police Station And Tahsil Gunderdehi, District : Balod, Chhattisgarh

---- Applicant

Versus

1. Smt. Khemin Bai, D/o Shri Panchu Ram, Aged About 50 Years,
 2. Smt. Shanti Bai D/o Shri Panchu Ram, Aged About 52 Years,
- Both By Caste - Teli, R/o Village Sankari, Police Station And Tahsil Gunderdehi, District : Balod, Chhattisgarh

---- Respondents

MCRC No. 2947 of 2019

- Johar Lal S/o Shri Panchu Ram Aged About 65 Years R/o Village Sankri, Police Station / Tahsil Gunderdehi, District : Balod, Chhattisgarh

---- Applicant

Versus

1. Smt. Khemin Bai, D/o Shri Panchu Ram, Aged About 50 Years,
 2. Smt. Shanti Bai, D/o Shri Panchu Ram, Aged About 52 Years,
- Both by Caste - Teli, R/o Village Sankari, Police Station And Tahsil Gunderdehi, District : Balod, Chhattisgarh

---- Respondent

For Applicants	:	Shri R. S. Marhas, Dr. Kumaresh Tiwari and Shri N.P. Thakur, Advocate for the respective applicants.
For Respondent/ Complainants	:	Ms. Aditi Singhvi, Advocate

Hon'ble Smt. Justice Rajani Dubey**Order on Board****21/06/2019**

1. As these two applications (MCRC No. 2763/2019 and MCRC No. 2947/2019) under Section 439 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 for grant of regular bail to the applicants,

who are in custody since 06.04.2019 in connection with Complaint Case No. 148/2019, pending in the Court of Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Gunderdehi, District – Balod for the offence punishable under Sections 467, 471 & 193 of the Indian Penal Code, are being disposed off by this common order.

2. As per the prosecution case, the applicants by forging thumb impressions of their sisters namely Suruj Bai, Shanta Bai and Khemin Bai, created a forged letter of consent purportedly relinquishing their share in ancestral property and based on said consent letter, they got deleted names of their sisters from the revenue records.
3. Learned counsel for the applicants submits that the applicants have been falsely implicated in the present case. He would further submit that the other co-accused has already been granted bail by this Court. He further submits that this is a complaint case and trial will likely to take some more time, therefore, they may be released on bail
4. On the other hand, learned counsel for the complainants opposes the bail application.
5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the case diary.
6. Considering the totality of the facts and circumstances of the case, nature of allegation levelled against the applicants, the fact that they are in custody since 06.04.2019 and have no criminal antecedents, but without commenting anything on merits, I am inclined to release the applicants on regular bail.
7. Accordingly, the bail application is allowed and it is directed

that the applicants shall be released on bail on their furnishing a personal bond of Rs.25,000/- to each with one surety for the like sum to the satisfaction of the concerned Court for their appearance before it as and when directed.

8. Certified copy as per rules.

Sd/-
(Rajani Dubey)
Judge